Legal Declaration by a U.S. Army Veteran Against Systemic Constitutional Violation

In Defense of the Constitution: A Structural Case Against Government Overreach

I, Jason M. Ernst, a United States Army veteran, submit this legal declaration with full awareness of its weight, truth, and consequence. I do not do so in rebellion—I do so in fulfillment of the oath I took:

"To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

That oath has no expiration date.

This document, *Constitutional Indictment: A Veteran's Case Against the United States Government*, contains a verified, fact-based, case-supported, amendment-by-amendment breakdown of how the United States government—across its legislative, executive, and judicial branches—**has violated all 27 amendments of the U.S. Constitution.** Not by accident. By structure. By design. For gain.

The Constitution is no longer enforced as supreme law. It is interpreted as optional language—twisted, redefined, or bypassed to preserve government power at the direct expense of the American people. That is not liberty. That is not a republic. That is **systemic betrayal**.

Each amendment in this document includes:

- The constitutional text.
- A breakdown of how it is actively circumvented.
- One documented legal precedent (case law or federal action) that proves its breach.
- My own testimony—delivered as one of the governed and one who served.

This is not an act of sedition.

This is a demand for truth.

No government—no matter how decorated in flag or tradition—can claim legitimacy while violating the foundational contract with its people. The moment government immunity outweighs constitutional accountability, democracy is dead in everything but marketing.

This document has no political agenda. It is not left. It is not right. **It is correct. And it is complete.**

I am delivering this not only to the public, but to the very institutions responsible for these violations: Congress, the courts, the media, and the law schools that train the next generation of interpreters. I am also delivering it to the watchdogs—the journalists, activists, and constitutional defenders who claim to protect the people's rights. This is their case now.

Let the facts speak.

Let the law answer.

Let history judge.

You may ignore me. But you will never again claim you didn't know.

I did the work. I assembled history and the law the way it happened. None of this brief is speculation, legal trickery, or frivolous.

It is fact and truth assembled from a deeply complicated and designed system so the foundation of our country is meaningless—not by the people—but by the government who enshrined it to begin with.

The courts and the government itself must be called to answer the charges levied **By the People and For the People.**

—

Jason M. Ernst

U.S. Army Veteran

Constitutional Witness

Citizen of the United States of America

May 2025

Constitutional Indictment:

A Veteran’s Case Against the United States Government

“People violate the law and get punished by the law from a government who violates the law in order to punish those who violate the law—and call it justice.” *—Jason M Ernst*

The following brief outlines ways in which the U.S. government violates all 27 Amendments through structure, policy, or application. Each section begins with the original constitutional amendment, followed by a clear breakdown of how the government has failed to uphold it. This document serves as both a legal challenge and a public reckoning, offering undeniable evidence of structural betrayal across the foundational freedoms of the United States.

Amendment 1: *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.*

The Pay-to-Protest Paradox

The First Amendment guarantees the right to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. This right is foundational to democratic participation.

However, the imposition of permit requirements and associated fees creates an unconstitutional barrier. When citizens must pay the government to exercise a right, that right becomes a privilege.

This isn't just a philosophical contradiction—it's already been deemed unconstitutional.

In **Forsyth County v. Nationalist Movement (1992)**, the Supreme Court ruled that a government cannot charge varying fees for protest permits based on the content of the speech or anticipated public reaction. The Court held that doing so placed an unconstitutional burden on free expression. The First Amendment does not allow government officials to price-tag free speech or use permit costs as a filter for dissent.

This ruling confirms what common sense already makes clear: If a citizen has to pay the government to protest the government, their right has already been sold. The right to peaceably assemble and petition is not conditional. It does not require sponsorship, approval, or funding. And it certainly doesn't come with a receipt.

"You can protest only if you can afford to."

Recognized Religion Bias

The First Amendment ensures the free exercise of religion. However, this freedom is implicitly restricted to legally or culturally 'recognized' religions.

Unorthodox beliefs, emerging spiritual systems, or secular philosophies such as atheism and humanism are often dismissed or excluded in legal accommodations.

This selective recognition perpetuates religious inequality and elevates traditional theistic structures over non-traditional or non-religious belief systems.

"Believe what you want as long as it's on this list—which has a leaderboard."

Amendment 2: *A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.*

Yet, infringement exists at local, state, and federal levels.

The Second Amendment guarantees that the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. Yet, restrictions such as background checks, waiting periods, registration, bans on certain weapons, and concealed carry limitations introduce contradictions in interpretation.

“You can have guns, just not guns as good as ours.”

The National Guard is not a citizen militia—it is a government-owned enforcement branch. It is funded, trained, and federally controllable, even though it is sold as a “state-run” force.

The Dick Act of 1903 codified the National Guard and strategically replaced the people’s militia with a government-controlled entity. While the Second Amendment intended for the people to serve as the check on government tyranny, the Dick Act gave the government a loyal, well-funded military branch under its command.

To make matters worse, the federal government can activate the National Guard at will, for almost any reason—from immigration enforcement to crowd control against “unruly” citizens. The balance of power is gone.

“Your militia is our militia.”

Citizens now hold pistols while the state holds tanks. The gap isn’t just technological—it’s legal, financial, and strategic. The Constitution didn’t fail. It was strategically neutralized.

The Dick Act wasn’t just misnamed. It was a calculated dick move. It gave the government the bigger stick—then outlawed the people from carrying anything close to equal.

The Supreme Court confirmed this in **District of Columbia v. Heller (2008)**, ruling that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess firearms for lawful purposes—such as self-defense—unconnected to militia service. This dismantled decades of false interpretation suggesting that only "well-regulated militias" were protected, exposing the lie that the government could regulate gun ownership purely by tying it to organized state forces. Heller proved that the people—not the state's armed bodies—were the intended holders of that right.

This reveals a critical breach: the Constitution either means what it says, or it is selectively interpreted based on political will—undermining legal consistency and citizen trust.

"It means what government says it means."

Amendment 3: *No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.*

The government isn't in your home physically. It's there digitally.

The Third Amendment is seen as obsolete because no one's forcing soldiers into guest rooms anymore. But the principle—the right to privacy and consent inside one's dwelling—is violated every day.

Today, "soldiers" wear suits. They type on keyboards. They monitor and enforce, not with boots, but with surveillance systems.

- Your phone listens without warrant.
- Your smart TV collects without consent.
- Your Alexa feeds data to third parties.
- Law enforcement retrieves home surveillance footage without notice or approval.

Making things worse—by design—the unhoused have no protection under this amendment—no space the government is prohibited from entering. So they are detained, moved, or penalized—without needing consent.

Engblom v. Carey (1982) – A U.S. Court of Appeals case, not Supreme Court. In this case, correctional officers in New York alleged that National Guard members were quartered in their dormitories during a strike without their consent, violating their Third Amendment rights. The court ruled that:

- The Third Amendment applies to the states via incorporation.
- National Guardsmen may be considered "soldiers."
- The plaintiffs had sufficient property interest for a claim.

This is the closest the courts have come to directly applying the Third Amendment in modern times.

And what about the word "soldier"? The amendment uses it narrowly. But what is a soldier, really?

A soldier is any person, animal or device acting as the enforcement arm of the government.

Examples include:

- Police
- Federal agents
- Code enforcement
- DHS monitors

- NSA contractors
- Drones
- Satellites
- Security cameras

All are functionally soldiers because every one is used for government enforcement.

And they’re not only quartered in your home—they’re quartered in your devices, your infrastructure, your movements, and your digital memory.

This isn’t an outdated amendment. It’s the most violated one of all—rebranded through technology.

Amendment 4: *The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.*

People are under constant surveillance by government-controlled cameras—without a warrant, without suspicion, and without cause.

The government claims these cameras are for public safety, yet they face homes, sidewalks, schools, parks, and streets—watching every move of law-abiding citizens. That is not safety. That is default suspicion.

Being in public doesn't mean we lose our rights.

It means our rights should be more protected, not less. The idea that probable cause can be replaced by proximity is a direct violation of the Fourth Amendment.

Facial recognition and license plate readers track our location across time. Data logs are stored, cross-referenced, and acted upon—all without a judge, a warrant, or even our awareness.

Our digital behavior is seized daily—searches, locations, conversations, and device metadata. We don't own my information. The state does.

Carpenter v. United States (2018) proved what most people already knew but couldn't legally prove: our phones track us, and the government doesn't need a warrant to follow. Until this case, the government could access historical cell phone location data without judicial oversight—using third-party records as a loophole.

The Supreme Court ruled that accessing this data without a warrant violates the Fourth Amendment. In a 5-4 decision, the Court said that digital tracking constitutes a search and requires probable cause—even if the information is held by a third party.

This case shattered the illusion that your phone doesn't rat you out.

Your location is not public property. Your life is not metadata. And your right to privacy doesn't expire when you turn on your phone.

"Everything you do, everywhere you go, and everything you say will be recorded. Deal with it."

Reverse warrants flip the Constitution. Law enforcement doesn't search for a suspect—they collect everyone and work backward. That's not investigation. That's digital fishing.

The Fourth Amendment requires specific warrants. But dragnet surveillance, predictive policing, and AI profiling violate the entire premise of individual suspicion.

“We don’t have or need a warrant unless we decide we do.”

Mass surveillance is protected under the guise that it’s necessary for national security.

Security from who?

- The government watches all citizens, not just threats.
- The 4th Amendment guarantees privacy—it doesn’t say “unless it’s for your safety.”
- Mass surveillance treats every citizen as a potential criminal. That’s not security. That’s preemptive control.
- And if they tie you to a crime? The surveillance they had no right to have, or probable cause to have, will be Exhibit A at your trial.

“If we must be watched to be protected, then we am neither protected nor free.”

And for those without property? There is no protection.

If you sleep in a public place, the government can search, question, relocate, and detain you—because you have no “effects” to defend and nowhere the state cannot follow.

The Patriot Act didn’t just damage the Fourth Amendment. It quietly replaced it. Secret courts. Delayed-notice searches. Warrantless taps.

None of this belongs in a constitutional republic.

“You are always the primary suspect.”

Amendment 5: *No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury… nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb… nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself… nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law… nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.*

"Innocent until proven guilty" is not in the Constitution. It's a slogan used to justify a process that does the opposite.

If you are charged, accused, or even suspected, you are treated as guilty from the moment of contact:

- Detained without conviction.
- Smeared in public databases.
- Penalized financially through bail, legal fees, and court costs—before a single verdict is issued.

Silence is supposed to be a right. Instead, it's a red flag. The Fifth Amendment promises you don't have to speak against yourself—but if you stay silent, law enforcement, the media, and the public assume guilt. That voids the protection through implication.

The government codified how to violate the Fifth Amendment in **Miranda v. Arizona (1966)**. They ruled that suspects must be informed of their right to remain silent and have an attorney—but once those words are spoken, any response can be used to convict you.

It created the illusion of protection while actually protecting the system. You were warned. Now it's fair game.

- If you talk, you're punished.
- If you stay silent, they call it "suspicious."

Either way, the burden of innocence is on you.

"You are guilty until proven innocent."

Due process is not justice. It's choreography. It's a step-by-step performance of legality—accessible only to those who can afford it.

- The rich delay, defy, deflect, and defeat prosecution.
- The poor are coerced into plea deals, stuck with overworked defenders, and buried in stacked charges.

You don't get to challenge authority. You're just forced to follow it, then hope you can later prove it was unjust.

“You can be proven innocent, but not until after we smear you with guilt.”

Double Jeopardy is a technicality—easily bypassed:

- Found not guilty in criminal court? They’ll sue you in civil.
- Cleared at the state level? Get hit with federal charges next.

“One way or the other we will ruin you.”

Eminent domain is legalized theft:

- The government takes your home, your land, your property—and calls it “public use.” They assign a value. They write a check. You have no say.
- Who owns what is up to the government.

The Fifth Amendment pretends to protect you. But it only activates once the damage is done. You don’t get liberty. You get the right to argue for it—after it’s already been taken.

Amendment 6: *In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.*

You have the right to a speedy trial—unless you can't afford one. People sit in jail for weeks, months, even years, without being convicted—waiting on a system that claims to protect their time. That isn't justice. That's illegal confinement disguised as procedure.

Barker v. Wingo (1972) confirmed this betrayal. The Supreme Court ruled that even a five-year delay in trial didn't violate the Sixth Amendment. Why? Because the defendant didn't object soon enough. The decision turned a right into a trap: stay silent, and they say you waived it. Speak up, and you still wait. Barker proved that a "speedy trial" is not guaranteed—it's a bureaucratic riddle where delay is excused, rights are conditional, and justice can be postponed indefinitely.

The state delays:

- On purpose.
- With paperwork.
- With overburdened public defenders.
- With hidden pressure tactics.

You have the right to a trial—but you'll be punished if you use it.

This is the trial penalty trap:

- Plead guilty? Lesser charges.
- Exercise your right to trial? Prosecutors go for the maximum. They stack charges. They aim for the highest sentence possible.

"You were always guilty. Just agree so we can move on."

The charges change if you resist the accusation. This is the silent mutation of the legal system.

- Question a cop? Obstruction.
- Flinch or run? Resisting arrest.
- Stay silent? Noncompliant.
- Try to film them? Interference.

The original accusation is no longer the full story. And every reaction becomes a new charge.

The Sixth Amendment promises fairness. But fairness doesn’t exist when the system punishes you for fighting it, delays your freedom, and evolves its case against you depending on your resistance to authority.

“Do what you’re told—or you’ll regret it.”

Amendment 7: *In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.*

The $20 clause is a joke. It hasn't been updated in over two centuries. Yet we pretend it still protects the average citizen. And let's be honest—$20 is classified as petty theft and a misdemeanor in almost every jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, people are fined:

- $500 for code violations
- $1,000 for traffic infractions
- $5,000+ by bureaucratic agencies

The government just takes your money, and your only option is to fight it—without a trial, without a jury, and without recourse unless you can afford it.

You get a jury trial if someone tries to steal $20–but not when the government does it legally for $2,000.

"Do as we say not as we do."

Civil asset forfeiture proves this amendment is meaningless. Cops can seize your car, cash, or home with no conviction. You're not guaranteed a jury. You're not even presumed innocent.

In **United States v. $124,570 U.S. Currency (2006)**, federal agents seized over $124,000 in cash from a man at an airport without charging him with any crime. He wasn't arrested. He wasn't convicted. And he never saw a jury.

The court ruled the government could keep the money based on "suspicion." No trial. No due process. Just legal gymnastics—targeting property instead of the person.

This is how civil asset forfeiture works. It bypasses the 7th Amendment entirely. The Constitution promises a jury. The government delivers a seizure.

Citizens can be sued—but can't use the same process against the state. You try to sue the government?

You hit:

- Dismissals
- Sovereign immunity
- Administrative hearings (no jury)

But they can sue you, fine you, or seize your property without any of those obstacles. Most civil cases never reach a jury anyway.

They're:

- Settled under pressure
- Crushed with legal costs
- Decided by judges
- Or delayed until you run out of time, money, or both

So yes, the Seventh Amendment "preserves" the right to a jury. But only on paper.

In practice:

- You don't have the time.
- You don't have the money.
- And the system doesn't want to hear from you.

"We have unlimited means, time and authority to break you."

Amendment 8: *Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.*

Excessive bail isn't rare—it's standard. It's used as a financial barrier to freedom, especially for the poor.

If you can't pay:

- You wait in jail for months.
- You lose your job, your housing, your custody rights.
- You're pressured to take a plea just to get out.

In some cases, no bail is set at all—meaning you're held indefinitely, based not on guilt, but on risk assessment, appearance, or assumed threat.

Fines are always excessive—because they're revenue. They aren't tied to justice. They're tied to what the system can extract.

- $250 for expired tags.
- $1,000 for a minor code violation.
- $10,000+ in court fees, interest, and surcharges.

And if you can't pay?

- Late fees.
- License suspension.
- Jail time.

Cruelty hasn't been abolished. It's been rebranded.

- Solitary confinement for weeks or months.
- Medical neglect.
- Prison rape.
- Forced labor for pennies.
- Psychological torture dressed as "discipline."

The Supreme Court itself confirmed this systemic cruelty in **Brown v. Plata (2011)**. California's prison system was so overcrowded that inmates died waiting for medical care. Some were held in phone-booth sized cages for days. The Court ruled that this wasn't just mismanagement—it was a direct violation of the Eighth Amendment. Cruel and unusual wasn't abstract anymore. It was visible, quantifiable, and state-sponsored.

The Court didn't just slap California's wrist. It ordered mass prisoner releases. Why? Because the abuse was so widespread that fixing it while keeping everyone incarcerated was impossible.

"When the state becomes a warehouse for human misery, it stops being a justice system—and becomes a torture machine."

And what counts as “unusual” punishment anymore?

- Sentencing a teenager to life.
- Giving 99 years for property crimes.
- Three-strike laws that lock people up for nonviolent offenses.
- Criminalizing mental illness, addiction, or poverty.

The Eighth Amendment didn’t fail. It was outmaneuvered. The cruelty never stopped. It just changed clothes and got a paycheck.

“We define the terms—not you.”

Amendment 9: *The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.*

This is the most ignored amendment in the entire Constitution. It says what no government wants to admit:

- You have rights even if we didn't write them down.

But in practice, it's flipped:

- If your right isn't listed, it's denied.
- If it threatens control, it's dismissed.
- If it empowers you beyond permission, it's ignored.

"Additional unwritten unalienable rights? We don't think so."

The Ninth kills every restrictive argument—if anyone would use it. This amendment destroys the foundation of:

- Body autonomy restrictions
- Privacy invasions
- Land use laws
- Surveillance
- Expression limitations

Because it means you don't need written approval to be free. But the system doesn't work that way.

Instead, it says:

- "Prove your right exists."
- "Show me where it says you can."
- "If it's not protected explicitly, we can regulate it."

The Ninth Amendment should be the people's trump card. But it's never played.

- Courts don't use it.
- Politicians don't quote it.
- Lawyers don't argue it.

Because if it mattered, the entire control structure would collapse. The Ninth Amendment is a firewall against tyranny and no one's managing it.

Griswold v. Connecticut (1965) shattered that illusion. The Supreme Court invoked the Ninth Amendment to strike down a state law banning birth control—even though no specific constitutional text mentioned "privacy" or "contraception." Justice Goldberg emphasized that the Ninth proves fundamental rights exist beyond what's written. This wasn't theory. It was precedent. The Court said

plainly: just because a right isn’t listed doesn’t mean it doesn’t exist—and the Ninth is what protects it.

But instead of expanding from this decision, courts retreated. They allowed this amendment to become a forgotten footnote. Griswold proved the Ninth had power. The government just decided never to use it again.

“If we never mention or allow it, people will forget it’s even there.”

Amendment 10: *The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.*

This amendment is supposed to limit federal power. Instead, it's proof that limits don't matter.

The federal government wasn't given the power to control:

- Education
- Healthcare
- Energy
- Infrastructure
- Surveillance

Yet it does. Every day. With zero accountability.

The Tenth says the federal government has boundaries. The government acts like the map doesn't exist.

States aren't independent. They're franchises.

- The federal government bribes states with funding.
- It threatens them with enforcement and legal action.
- It creates "optional" programs and then punishes states that opt out.

State sovereignty doesn't exist if the cost of defiance is collapse.

"Comply or we'll drain you dry."

NFIB v. Sebelius (2012) exposed the truth: the federal government doesn't need to change your state's laws—it just threatens to cut off your money until you do it yourself.

Congress tried to force states to expand Medicaid by saying, "take the deal or lose every dollar you already get."

The Court finally drew a line and said no. But that line came after decades of fiscal blackmail.

The government doesn't have to control your state directly. It just has to pay for enough of it to own you.

Sovereignty isn't constitutional. It's conditional.

And what about the people? The amendment says powers are reserved to "the people."

But how?

- Can the people nullify laws? No.
- Can they stop federal overreach directly? No.
- Can they bypass state control? No.

You can’t say power belongs to the people if the people can’t touch it.

- The Ninth says we retain rights.
- The Tenth says we retain power.

But both are locked behind systems designed to never let us use them.

The Tenth Amendment doesn’t protect freedom. It defines control. It draws the lines between governments—not between government and the individual. Power is reserved to the government closest to you. Not to you.

Amendment 11: *The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.*

This amendment didn't protect the people. It protected the states. If a state violates your rights—you can't take them to federal court unless they allow it.

That betrayal became law in **Alden v. Maine (1999)**. The Supreme Court ruled that state employees couldn't sue their state in state court for violating the Fair Labor Standards Act—even though Congress said they could.

The Court's logic? Sovereign immunity is bigger than federal law.

Translation? The state can break federal law, and you still can't touch it.

Alden proved the 11th Amendment isn't a shield for the state—it's a sword against the people.

That's not liberty. That's sovereign immunity—a royal concept smuggled into a republic.

1. States Are Above the Law—By Law

This amendment gives state governments the power to:

- Deny federal lawsuits
- Evade accountability
- Shield themselves from citizen litigation

So if you're harmed by your state, your only path to justice is:

- That same state's court system
- That same state's laws
- That same state's permission

"How do you check power when power gets to say, '*You can't check me*'?"

2. The Federal Courts Are Powerless to Protect You

The Constitution says federal courts exist to settle disputes between states and citizens. The Eleventh Amendment breaks that promise. It strips the federal judiciary of its power to:

- Rein in state abuses
- Protect citizens across state lines
- Hold states accountable for overreach

“What’s the point of a national Constitution if states can opt out of consequences?”

3. This Amendment Was the Blueprint for Modern Immunity

It paved the way for:

- Qualified immunity
- Sovereign immunity
- Prosecutorial immunity
- Legislative immunity

“The government built a shield for authority—with the people locked out.”

The Eleventh Amendment isn’t about justice. It’s about untouchability. It doesn’t defend your rights—it defends the structure that can violate them.

“If I can’t hold power accountable, then I don’t live in a democracy—I live in a managed illusion.”

Amendment 12: *The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President… they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President…*

(The full amendment details how electoral votes are counted, how ties are resolved, and how the House of Representatives breaks presidential deadlocks.)

This amendment didn't fix the election system. It locked it down.

Born out of the chaos of 1800, its purpose was to clean up electoral confusion. Instead, it institutionalized political theater and buried democracy under party loyalty and manipulation.

1. It Cemented the Two-Party Trap

Before the 12th, the runner-up became Vice President. Rivalry created checks.

Afterward, Presidents and VPs were pre-matched from the same party—no opposition, no tension, just control.

- Third parties? Functionally erased.
- Independent thought? Systemically blocked.
- Voter choice? An illusion between Red and Blue.

"We don't elect leaders. We pick from two pre-selected brands."

2. It Reinforced the Electoral College—Which Was Built to Empower Slaveholders

The Electoral College was designed during slavery to boost the political power of Southern states.

- Slaves couldn't vote
- Slaves had no rights
- But they counted as 3/5 of a person toward population totals

That boosted slave states' House seats and Electoral College votes, giving the ruling class more presidential power without ever giving voice to the enslaved.

"The plantation had a vote. The enslaved had none. That was the point."

And that rigged architecture still exists—amplifying smaller states and suppressing populous ones. The system hasn't been repaired. It's just been repurposed.

3. Gerrymandering Makes the House Tie-Breaker a Farce

In a deadlocked election, the House of Representatives breaks the tie. But thanks to gerrymandering, the House is a pre-loaded deck.

- Districts are drawn by politicians to protect their party
- Minority votes are diluted
- Outcomes are manufactured before ballots are cast

And to top it off:

Each state gets one vote, no matter the population.

“30 million people in California = 1 vote. 600,000 in Wyoming = also 1 vote. That’s not democracy—it’s a distortion.”

4. It Enables Legalized Election Tampering

The Electoral College and gerrymandering are coordinated fraud, wrapped in constitutional language.

- Popular vote? Can be ignored.
- Swing states? Hold the entire country hostage.
- Faithless electors? Still possible.
- “Safe” states? Entirely disregarded.

The Supreme Court itself proved how fragile and manipulable our electoral process really is in **Bush v. Gore (2000)**. When the 2000 presidential election came down to Florida, the Court stepped in—not to ensure fairness, but to shut down the recount. In a 5-4 decision, it handed the presidency to George W. Bush. The justices claimed the recount violated the Equal Protection Clause, but then went one step further: they declared that the ruling should not be used as precedent.

In plain English? “This only works when we say it does.”

The ruling didn’t fix the system—it exposed it. The Supreme Court confirmed that our elections can be decided not by voters, but by judges. That isn’t democracy. That’s scripted power transfer. It proved the 12th Amendment doesn’t protect the will of the people—it protects the system that overrides it.

The Electoral College gave the blueprint. Bush v. Gore executed it.

“The 12th Amendment created a controlled environment for simulated elections.”

Amendment 13:

Section 1

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2

Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Slavery was never abolished. It was redesigned. The 13th Amendment didn't end slavery—it rebranded it under a new rule:

- If you've been convicted of a crime, you are property again.

But the real trap is this:

- Everything the government controls can become a crime.

Once "crime" became the loophole, the system expanded its reach:

- Over-policing
- Over-criminalization
- Mass incarceration
- Poverty-based punishment
- Policy-based violations

And with Section 2, Congress gave itself the power to define and enforce this structure however it wants.

What emerged is a new breed of slavery—systemic, modernized, digitized, and distributed across every layer of society.

Here are six living forms of slavery operating under the illusion of legality:

1. Economic Slavery

- You work to survive.
- You're taxed before you touch your earnings.
- You need digital tools, transportation, and full submission to participate.
- Your labor value is dictated by the system that profits from it.

"If I must labor to live—and that labor is taxed before I live—then I am owned."

2. Sexual Slavery

- Sex is criminalized if monetary compensation is received and/or the act itself is otherwise deemed illegal.
- Marriage is regulated by the state.
- Reproductive rights are revoked in certain states and restricted in many.
- Consent and control over your own body are legislated, judged, and licensed.

“If I need approval to use my own body, then I don’t own it.”

3. Residential Slavery

- You are punished for not having shelter.
- You need permits, licenses, and loans to legally exist on land.
- Public sleeping is illegal in multiple states.
- You are fined or jailed for occupying space without paying a system that owns everything.

“If I need permission to exist on earth, I don’t live here—I rent my existence.”

4. Health and Safety Slavery

- Emergency care is offered—then billed.
- Basic care is gated behind insurance.
- Eyes, ears, teeth? Not included.
- Medical debt is the leading cause of bankruptcy in a nation claiming freedom.

“If my survival depends on my ability to pay, then I don’t own my life—I lease it.”

5. Dependency Slavery (Basic Needs)

- Food, water, clothing, and shelter are conditional.
- Government aid requires paperwork, approval, and compliance.
- Programs can be denied, delayed, or underfunded.
- Without them, you either suffer—or turn to illegal means and become a criminal.

“If I need the system’s blessing to eat, then I am their dependent—by design.”

6. Political Slavery

- You vote—but only within manipulated lines.

- Districts are drawn to predetermine outcomes.
- Policy is written for donors, not citizens.
- Representation is performance—not power.

“If I can’t change anything, then I’m not participating. I’m being managed.”

And for those who are convicted? The mask comes off. In prison, slavery is no longer hidden—it’s legal.

- Forced labor
- No wage or pennies per hour
- Private contracts
- Corporations profiting from cages

“The 13th Amendment legalized slavery through crime. Then the system made everything a crime.”

That isn’t conspiracy. That’s precedent. The Supreme Court confirmed this loophole in **Ruffin v. Commonwealth (1871)**, when it ruled that a convicted felon is “a slave of the State.” Read that again. Not a prisoner. Not an offender. A slave.

That decision—never overturned—opened the legal floodgates for states to exploit inmate labor and strip constitutional protections under the excuse of conviction. And it’s still happening.

Prisoners sew uniforms, staff kitchens, fight wildfires, and clean highways—for pennies, or for nothing at all. And if they refuse? Solitary, punishment, or worse. The 13th Amendment didn’t end slavery. It outsourced it.

Section 2 gives Congress the power to enforce this structure however it wants. And it did. Not to protect you—but to enslave anyone convicted of a crime.

It explicitly delegates enforcement to Congress, and Congress used that power to create legislation—like the Black Codes, convict leasing systems, and later the War on Drugs—that targeted vulnerable populations, funneled them into prison labor, and legally re-instituted slavery under a new name.

“We **will** own you.”

Amendment 14 :

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;

nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;

nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The 14th Amendment—A Masterclass in Word Manipulation

This amendment is often portrayed as the backbone of equal protection and citizenship.

But when you break it down word by word, it becomes a legal illusion wrapped in contradiction.

1. The Constitution Quietly Demotes Your Rights to "Privileges"

The phrase "privileges or immunities" betrays everything the Constitution claims to stand for.

- A right is inalienable.
- A privilege is conditional.

By calling your Constitutional protections "privileges," the 14th Amendment opens the door to:

- Revocation
- Restriction
- Legal reinterpretation

And worst of all, state-sanctioned violation disguised as compliance.

"If you must apply for it, pay for it, or qualify for it—it's not a right. It's a benefit. And benefits can be cut."

2. “Subject to the Jurisdiction Thereof” = Citizenship by Convenience

The line “born or naturalized… and subject to the jurisdiction thereof” is used to:

- Include people when politically useful
- Exclude them when it threatens the system

That’s how you get:

- U.S. citizens in territories (like Puerto Rico)
- Without equal rights, equal representation, or full access to federal programs

“You’re a citizen when it benefits the United States. You’re an outsider when it doesn’t.”

It also explains how immigrant families can be divided:

- A baby born in U.S. airspace = citizen
- The mother = “illegal alien”
- The family = split by law, forced into a state-dictated binary

“The Constitution welcomes the baby and criminalize the womb.”

3. Territorial Citizenship = Second-Class Status

If you’re born in U.S. territories (like Guam, American Samoa, Puerto Rico or the U.S. Virgin Islands), the Constitution says you’re a citizen.

But you don’t get:

- Full voting rights
- Electoral College representation
- Voting Senators
- Real Congressional voice

This is literally “taxation without representation.” And that is one of the primary reasons our founding fathers fled King George in England—founding America as a better system.

“The United States counts you as a citizen, but only when it needs your census number, your taxes, or your service.”

4. Equal Protection? Only If You’re Useful to the Machine

The phrase “equal protection of the laws” is meaningless when:

- Law enforcement disproportionately targets minorities
- Courts give unequal sentences for equal crimes
- Poverty, location, race, gender, sexuality, identity, age, and status (societal, employment, digital, economic, and legal) determine outcomes more than law itself

“Equal protection is a slogan, not a standard.”

There’s no protection from:

- Mass surveillance
- Police brutality
- Gerrymandering
- Legal immunity for officials
- Economic disenfranchisement
- Disparate sentencing
- Inaccessible healthcare
- Predatory licensing and fines

The law protects the system and the system protects itself. The people? Optional.

Conclusion: The 14th Amendment Is a Shield for the State, Not the Citizen

- It calls your rights “privileges”
- It selectively defines who qualifies
- It offers “equal protection” that never actually appears

“It was written to look like justice. It was structured to enforce the illusion.”

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez (1973)

This case ripped the mask off the 14th Amendment once and for all.

A group of parents argued that public school funding—based on local property taxes—created massive disparities in education. Poor districts had fewer resources, worse schools, and lower outcomes. They said this violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.

The Supreme Court disagreed.

They ruled that education is not a fundamental right under the Constitution—and therefore, unequal funding does not violate the 14th Amendment.

Let that sink in.

The government can underfund, overlook, and systemically neglect entire communities—and it’s legally acceptable because the Constitution doesn’t “guarantee” education.

The Court didn’t just dodge the issue. It rewrote equality as a matter of technicality. They said unless a law directly discriminates based on a suspect classification (like race), or infringes a fundamental right (like voting), it’s not their problem.

So unless you’re dealing with explicit racism or listed rights, you’re out of luck.

- Poor children? Not protected.
- Unequal opportunity? Not a violation.
- Lack of resources? Not unconstitutional.

The 14th Amendment, weaponized through Rodriguez, became a legal firewall against fairness. Not only does it fail to guarantee equal outcomes, it doesn’t even guarantee equal chances.

This amendment doesn’t defend the people. It defends the legal infrastructure that lets the government:

- Control who counts
- Define what rights apply

- And rewrite liberty as conditional compliance

Amendment 15:

Section 1

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Section 2

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

What It Was Supposed to Do:

The 15th Amendment was meant to guarantee voting rights for Black Americans after the Civil War.

It said you can't deny someone the right to vote because of:

- Their race
- Their color
- Their former status as a slave

That's it.

What Actually Happened:

1. The 15th Amendment left the door wide open for loopholes.

It said you can't deny a vote because of race—but it said nothing about:

- Literacy tests
- Poll taxes
- Residency rules
- Criminal records
- Gerrymandered districts
- ID requirements
- Purging voter rolls
- Language barriers
- Closed polling locations in targeted areas

So they used those instead.

"They couldn't block the vote by color—so they blocked it by code."

2. “Previous Condition of Servitude” Became “Current Criminal Record”

After slavery, the system reinvented servitude through:

- Mass incarceration
- Jim Crow laws
- The War on Drugs
- Voter disenfranchisement laws

Today:

- Millions of Americans (disproportionately Black) can’t vote because they have a felony
- And even after serving time, states can block voting rights indefinitely

“The chains were removed from their wrists and wrapped around their ballots.”

3. Gerrymandering and Voter Suppression = Structural Racism by Design

States redraw maps to:

- Isolate minority voters
- Dilute their collective power
- Maintain political dominance

This is modern redlining—done with district lines instead of property laws.

“Its not that minorities can’t vote. It’s that their votes are buried under 100,000 meaningless ones.”

4. The 15th Says “Shall Not Be Denied”—But Doesn’t Guarantee Access

You’re “allowed” to vote.

But they can:

- Make it hard
- Make it confusing
- Make it dangerous
- Make it logistically impossible

Try voting in a district where:

- Your polling station moved

- Your name was purged
- Your ID “isn’t sufficient”
- Your job doesn’t give time off
- Your mail-in ballot was “late”
- Your signature “didn’t match”

“What good is a right if it’s too hard to use?”

Conclusion: The 15th Amendment is a ghost law—honored in principle, ignored in practice.

It didn’t secure the right to vote—it simply outlawed one specific method of denying it. By focusing solely on race, color, or previous condition of servitude, it left the door wide open for every other method of disenfranchisement. States no longer need to say, “You can’t vote because you’re Black.” Instead, they say, “You can’t vote because you have a felony,” or “because your ID doesn’t qualify,” or “because your polling place was moved,” or “because we redrew your district.”

The result is the same: minority voices suppressed, working-class voters buried, and democratic power hoarded. The amendment was never updated, never clarified, and never given the strength to stand against evolving suppression. Its enforcement was outsourced to temporary legislation like the Voting Rights Act, which has since been dismantled.

The 15th is a law in name only. It gave the illusion of progress while the system adapted around it. Discrimination got smarter, quieter, and fully legal. The right to vote was never fully protected—only selectively tolerated.

Shelby County v. Holder (2013) wasn’t just a ruling—it was a surgical strike against the 15th Amendment.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was created to enforce the 15th Amendment. It required states with a history of racial discrimination to get federal approval before changing their voting laws. That system worked. It stopped poll tests. It blocked voter suppression. It exposed discrimination before it could infect elections.

Then came Shelby.

In a 5–4 decision, the Supreme Court gutted the Act’s pre-clearance formula. They said racism wasn’t a big enough threat anymore to justify oversight. In short? “We’ve made enough progress. Let’s go back to trusting the same states that suppressed the vote in the first place.”

The Court didn’t strike down the Voting Rights Act completely. It just disabled the part that gave it teeth. Without pre-clearance, states immediately began:

- Closing polling places in minority neighborhoods
- Passing strict voter ID laws

- Purging voter rolls
- Redistricting with racial intent

It wasn't theory. It was instant retaliation.

Shelby didn't just ignore the 15th Amendment—it dismantled the very mechanism designed to enforce it. It told the states: "We won't stop you anymore."

And the result?

- More barriers.
- Less access.
- Voter suppression in a suit and tie.

The Court didn't rule that racism was over. It ruled that we'd pretend it was—and then blamed Congress for not fixing the mess they created.

"We took the muzzle off the dog. If it bites you, that's Congress's problem."

The 15th Amendment was always too polite. Shelby made that fatal. It proved that without constant enforcement, the right to vote is a temporary privilege—especially if you're poor, Black, or live in the wrong ZIP code.

Amendment 26: Voting Age and the Illusion of Equal Access

Amendment 26: The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of age.

Sounds solid, right?

But just like the 15th, this amendment was built with a flaw so obvious it should be disqualifying:

It says you can't be denied the vote because of your age—but it says nothing about the tools, systems, or barriers that specifically target and suppress young voters.

You can't deny the vote based on **age**.

But you can:

- Underfund college precincts
- Purge student voter rolls
- Gerrymander campuses into irrelevance
- Restrict same-day registration
- Ban dorm addresses as valid ID
- Schedule elections during finals

That's not a loophole. That's sabotage disguised as compliance.

“You can vote when you’re 18–as long as we make it logistically possible.”

Amendment 16: *Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.*

What it did:

- Gave the federal government direct access to your income without using state population as a filter
- Did not specify “federal” Congress, leaving the door open for states and local governments to mimic the same power
- Created the legal and structural template for universal taxation

How it broke everything:

2. **Implied Language:** Unlimited Replication—
   The phrase “Congress shall have power” sounds specific—but every state has its own congress. Because the Constitution didn’t clarify, every level of government followed the precedent. Now, every government body taxes income, purchases, property, and death itself.
3. **From Income to Everything**
   “From whatever source derived” means it’s not just wages. It includes:

- Tips
- Inheritance
- Capital gains
- Property
- Business
- Gifts
- Retirement
- Death
- Garage sales

> If money moves, they can and will claim it if they know about it and decide to.

4. **Compliance or Punishment**
   The system doesn’t ask—it demands. Refuse to comply and you face:

- Wage garnishment
- Asset seizure
- Fines
- Jail time
- Lifelong financial ruin

This isn't taxation. This is coercion through law.

5. **The Slave Chain Between Labor and Life**
   You work first for the government. You pay before you eat. You are taxed at every stage:

- Earn it – income tax
- Spend it – sales tax
- Save it – capital gains tax
- Own it – property tax
- Die with it – estate tax
- Give it to your kids – inheritance tax
- Lottery or gambling win - earnings tax

The state always gets its cut. You just get what's left.

The Redundancy of Enslavement

This isn't the only amendment that locks you down. The 14th Amendment already reclassified your rights as privileges, giving government conditional control over legal status and equal protection. The 16th reinforced that structure through income control.

- 14th = You exist by permission
- 16th = You earn by permission

Together, they form a binary system designed to:

- Enforce compliance
- Extract wealth
- Criminalize resistance
- Make freedom a slogan, not a state of being

This is not representation. This is not fairness. This is economic servitude—with legal precedent.

That truth was exposed in **Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co. (1916)**. The Supreme Court ruled that the 16th Amendment did not give Congress new taxing power. It merely clarified an existing power—allowing income taxes to be collected without apportionment among the states.

But the ruling also confirmed something the government would rather you didn't notice: income tax still had to obey constitutional limits. It couldn't violate other rights. It couldn't be enforced arbitrarily. It couldn't override due process.

The IRS ignored all of that.

Since Brushaber, the government has treated the 16th as a blank check to tax income however it wants—while demanding total compliance, threatening jail time, and weaponizing fear. But the Court never gave them that license.

Brushaber didn't unleash financial tyranny. The government just pretended it did—and built an empire on that lie.

The result? You are required to declare your income, submit your identity, hand over your financial records, and pray you did it correctly—because if you didn't, the burden of proof is now on you.

The 16th Amendment wasn't just misused. It was hijacked.

Amendment 17:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: Provided, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

What it did:

- Transferred the power to elect U.S. Senators from state legislatures to the general voting public
- Was intended to increase democracy and reduce corruption in Senate appointments
- Allowed governors to make temporary Senate appointments if a seat is vacated

Why it's broken:

1. It destroyed state power in the federal structure

Originally, U.S. Senators were chosen by state legislatures, meaning they represented the interests of the states themselves in Congress. This created a two-house system:

- The House represented the people
- The Senate represented the states

By turning Senate elections over to the people, the states lost their direct seat at the federal table. Now both chambers are beholden to the same voter base, same lobbyists, and same media manipulation—erasing one full check on federal power.

"The Senate was never supposed to be a popularity contest. It was the states' firewall against overreach. Now it's just another PR battlefield."

That wasn't just design—it was law. In **Hawke v. Smith (1920)**, the Supreme Court ruled that a state couldn't even use a public referendum to approve or reject a Senator selected by the legislature. Why? Because the Constitution gave that power exclusively to the state legislature—not to the people, not to the governor,

not to a popular vote. The method of selecting Senators was non-negotiable. It was legislative only—by design and by ruling.

The Court made it crystal clear: the Framers intended Senators to represent the states as governments, not as populations. Hawke confirmed that structure. And then the 17th Amendment tore it down.

After the 17th passed, that firewall collapsed. State sovereignty was diluted. National political parties stepped in. Senators stopped representing the states that sent them—and started campaigning for votes like celebrities.

The 17th didn't enhance democracy. It amputated federalism.

2. It centralized power under national parties

Once the vote went to the people, national political parties began handpicking Senate candidates, flooding campaigns with funding, and swaying votes through mass media.

- Local control was lost
- State interests became secondary to national narratives
- Senators now act as brand ambassadors for their parties, not as guardians of their states

3. Temporary appointments = political opportunism

The amendment allows governors to appoint temporary Senators when vacancies occur. In reality, this gives a single executive unchecked influence to pick a U.S. Senator—often favoring their party and preserving political control.

"One person shouldn't appoint a voice for an entire state. That's not representation—it's substitution."

The 17th Amendment didn't fix corruption. It just changed who profits from it.

The Senate no longer answers to state governments. It answers to corporations, national donors, and whatever political machine can win the public theater. What was once a structural safeguard became a second House of Representatives—larger egos, longer terms, and even fewer consequences.

Amendment 18:

After one year from the ratification of this article, the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

What it did:

- Banned the manufacture, sale, and transport of alcohol in the U.S.
- Launched the era of Prohibition
- Was passed with the goal of improving morality, reducing crime, and protecting families
- Gave the federal government massive new authority over personal behavior and private commerce

Why it's broken:

1. It criminalized everyday citizens overnight

Prohibition didn't stop alcohol—it made it illegal for the poor while the wealthy drank in secret.

People who once lived normal lives became criminals not because they changed—but because the law did.

2. It empowered organized crime

By outlawing a substance in high demand, the government created a black market overnight.

The result:

- Exploding wealth and power for organized crime
- Corrupt law enforcement and politicians
- Violence, bootlegging, and public distrust

All in the name of "improving morality, reducing crime, and protecting families."

3. It weaponized morality into law

The amendment wasn't about safety—it was about control. A small, loud, moralist movement convinced the government to ban personal behavior on a national scale.

This set the precedent that personal liberty can be overridden by ideological pressure.

And the courts didn't stop it—they enforced it.

In Olmstead v. United States (1928), the Supreme Court ruled that wiretapped phone conversations—obtained without a warrant—were admissible as evidence in Prohibition-related cases. Why? Because the government didn't physically trespass on private property. So, according to the Court, no constitutional violation occurred.

Translation: If they don't touch you, they can still trap you.

The ruling stripped privacy from the Fourth and Fifth Amendments and handed new surveillance power to the state. The justification? Enforcement of morality. In the name of banning alcohol, the government gained tools to spy on citizens—and the Court said that was fine.

Prohibition didn't just criminalize behavior. It normalized government overreach.

Justice Louis Brandeis dissented—and delivered a warning that should have stopped the machine cold:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent.

Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers.

The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

It's clean, chilling, and prophetic—exactly the kind of tone that strengthens the fact Prohibition enabled surveillance and systemic overreach.

But the machine kept moving.

Olmstead proved that when moral panic drives law, liberty is the first casualty. The government overreached. The Court enabled it. And the people paid the price.

Conclusion: The 18th Amendment proved the government will criminalize anything—even freedom itself—if enough people are convinced it's righteous.

It wasn't about alcohol. It was about control.

The government tested its power to ban something fundamental, enforce it nationwide, and punish noncompliance with imprisonment and surveillance.

And when it collapsed under its own hypocrisy, they didn’t apologize—they just replaced it with new laws and called it reform.

The 18th wasn’t just a failed law—it was a warning. And we ignored it.

Amendment 19:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

What it did:

- Gave women the constitutional right to vote
- Overturned decades of political exclusion based on gender
- Was the result of a long, bitter struggle led by suffragists
- Allowed Congress to enforce voting equality through legislation

Why it matters—but isn't complete:

1. It granted a right that never should've been denied

The 19th didn't add a new right—it finally removed a restriction that had no moral, legal, or logical justification.

It exposed the hypocrisy of a system that claimed to be democratic while excluding half the population from participating in it.

"The 19th gave what men had no right to withhold in the first place: a voice."

2. It exposed how conditional rights really are

The amendment proves that "unalienable rights" can be delayed for over 130 years—until the government finally decides to catch up.

If voting is a right, why did it take a war, protests, and civil disobedience to access it?

3. It still didn't secure full equality

- Women gained the vote, but not equal representation
- They gained the ballot, but not the same protection in law, pay, or leadership
- Women of color still faced racist voter suppression even after 1920

- And still today, systemic inequality persists under the illusion of legal equality. Legal gender identification that doesn't match the Constitution or 19th Amendment could be interpreted as a loss of voting rights.

Conclusion: The 19th Amendment was a milestone—but not a finish line.

It was a necessary correction, not a gift.

It proved that rights in America are not born—they're negotiated, delayed, withheld, and fought for.

Minor v. Happersett (1875): The Supreme Court Confirmed Women Had No Right to Vote

Before the 19th Amendment existed, women were already citizens. They paid taxes. They followed laws. They lived under government rule.

But when Virginia Minor, a citizen of Missouri, tried to vote in 1872 and was denied based on her sex, she sued—arguing that the 14th Amendment guaranteed her equal protection and therefore the right to vote.

The Supreme Court didn't just disagree. It wrote one of the most brutally explicit rulings in U.S. history:

"The Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone."

Let that sink in.

The Court admitted that even as a citizen, Virginia Minor had no protected right to vote. It wasn't a question of race, income, or criminal record—it was gender. And the Court said clearly: citizenship does not equal voting rights.

This wasn't a fringe decision. This was the Supreme Court of the United States confirming that being born in this country and obeying its laws doesn't mean you have a voice.

That decision stood for 45 years.

So when the 19th Amendment was passed, it wasn't granting a new right. It was overriding a Supreme Court decision that made women legally invisible in democracy.

Minor v. Happersett didn't just expose a flaw. It proved the Constitution was never written for everyone.

"The Constitution protects equality only when the system has no other choice."

Amendment 20: (abridged for clarity)

- *Sets January 3rd as the start of Congressional terms*
- *Sets January 20th as the start of the President and Vice President's terms*
- *Details procedures for what happens if the President-elect dies or fails to qualify before taking office*
- *Allows Congress to pass laws about how to handle presidential succession in such cases*

What it did:

- Shortened the "lame duck" period, reducing the time an outgoing president and Congress could still exercise power after an election
- Clarified succession timing for the Presidency and Vice Presidency
- Cleaned up logistical gaps from the original Constitution that no longer made sense in a modern context

Why it's broken—or at least dangerous:

1. It leaves massive power in the hands of a "failed system"

The 20th was written to clean up transitions—but it still allows:

- A lame duck president to wield full executive power during a time when voters have already said "no more"
- A Congress that was voted out to still pass laws, confirm appointments, or declare war
- And even worse—electoral chaos to unfold during that transition, as we've already seen

"The people can scream for change—but the system gets to finish its business first."

2. "Failure to qualify" is vague and exploitable

The phrase "if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify" is wide open to interpretation.

What does it mean to "fail to qualify"?

- A legal indictment?
- A mental health evaluation?

- A missed certification deadline?

There is no constitutional definition—which means it can be abused politically, legally, or manipulatively, especially in times of crisis.

This isn't just theoretical. The Supreme Court already shut the door on this kind of power grab in **Powell v. McCormack (1969)**. In that case, Congress tried to block a duly elected representative—Adam Clayton Powell Jr.—from taking his seat by claiming he was "unfit." The Court ruled that Congress cannot invent qualifications or override elections. If a candidate meets the constitutional requirements, they must be seated. Period. No extra rules. No moral tests. No partisan edits. The ruling was clear: Congress doesn't get to redefine eligibility to suit its own agenda. That same logic applies here. The phrase "fails to qualify" cannot be weaponized as an open-ended excuse to disqualify a president-elect post-election. Powell makes that move unconstitutional on its face. If the people vote and the candidate meets the requirements, Congress can't play gatekeeper. The job isn't to approve the result. It's to honor it.

3. It allows Congress to write the fallback rules

If a president-elect dies, resigns, or "fails to qualify," who gets to decide what happens next?

Congress does.

And not the newly elected one—the one that's still in office.

So the very institution most politically motivated to shape the outcome gets to script the rules for replacing the incoming president.

That is a built-in conflict of interest that favors power retention over democratic fairness.

Conclusion: The 20th Amendment solved the wrong problem.

- It was meant to close logistical gaps—but it left political ones wide open.
- It shortened the lame duck period but did nothing to strip lame duck power.
- It wrote rules for transition but gave Congress authority to override them as needed.
- And it introduced vague terminology that could be legally twisted to block or delay presidential handover if the stakes are high enough.

The result? A thin, procedural layer hiding a fat, structural vulnerability.

"The 20th didn't remove corruption from transition—it just gave it a schedule."

The 25th Amendment was designed to protect the republic from incapacity—but it's never been tested to its full weight. Most politicians treat it like radioactive glass: too dangerous to touch, even when everything is on fire.

But the courts have already ruled—repeatedly—that fitness for office is not political. It's structural. If a president is unable to discharge their duties, the system must respond—or it has failed its sole job: continuity through competency.

Tarpley v. Greene (1988) was not about a president—it was about access, truth, and the role of government in silencing or enabling dysfunction. But the subtext was clear: if government knowingly allows misinformation or incapacity to dominate public function, it violates structural integrity. Tarpley reminded us that when public officials act under false pretense—or enable someone unfit to retain power—the injury isn't just political. It's constitutional harm.

And **Powell v. McCormack (1969)** already locked in the precedent: If a candidate meets constitutional requirements, Congress can't invent new ones. But the inverse also matters:

If a president no longer meets the requirements—because they cannot mentally or physically serve—then keeping them in power violates the very legitimacy of the office.

The 25th isn't optional. It's mandatory when the machine breaks down.

If a president is clearly compromised—mentally unwell, unable to understand briefings, or medically unstable—then invoking the 25th isn't political overreach. It's national obligation.

Failing to do so makes Congress an accessory to executive collapse.

The Constitution doesn't say "wait and see." It says act.

Amendment 21: (simplified)

6. *The 18th Amendment is repealed.*
7. *Alcohol regulation returns to the states.*
8. *Transport or importation of liquor in violation of state law remains prohibited.*

What it did:

- Officially ended Prohibition
- Gave individual states control over alcohol laws and sales
- Was the only amendment passed to undo a previous amendment
- Signaled that the federal government had overreached, failed, and needed to backtrack

Why it matters—and why it's still revealing:

1. It proves the government will walk back a law only when it becomes ungovernable

The 21st Amendment wasn't passed because the government realized it was wrong—it was passed because Prohibition failed spectacularly.

- Crime exploded.
- Trust imploded.
- The system was unmanageable.

"It wasn't morality that ended Prohibition—it was chaos."

2. It proved rights can be revoked—and restored—based on public pressure

The same government that banned alcohol through the 18th walked it back through the 21st—but only after the cost of enforcement outweighed the benefit of control.

This revealed a dangerous truth:

- Freedom is negotiable
- Rights are temporary
- And every amendment is reversible—if the government or majority wants it badly enough

3. It turned alcohol into a state-based revenue stream

By giving states full control, the 21st didn't free alcohol—it monetized it.

Each state:

- Set its own laws
- Created taxes
- Licensed distributors
- Controlled commerce

Now, liquor is no longer banned. It's just regulated, sold, and taxed. Which means the same control returned—just with a profit model.

Conclusion: The 21st Amendment didn't restore freedom—it restructured control.

The Supreme Court confirmed exactly how fragile and corruptible the 21st Amendment truly is in **Granholm v. Heald (2005)**. In a 5–4 decision, the Court ruled that states cannot discriminate between in-state and out-of-state alcohol producers when it comes to direct shipping laws. New York and Michigan had laws that allowed in-state wineries to ship directly to consumers—but blocked out-of-state competitors from doing the same.

The ruling said that this violated the Commerce Clause—even though the 21st Amendment supposedly gives states the power to control alcohol.

Translation? States can regulate alcohol—but only if the federal government says it's okay.

So much for "state control."

Granholm proved that the 21st Amendment doesn't actually give states full authority. It's a leash disguised as liberty. States get to "regulate" only within federal guidelines. Cross the invisible line—and the Commerce Clause snaps back like a whip.

That's not freedom. That's federal supremacy disguised as state choice.

So even the one amendment created to undo federal overreach is still tethered to federal conditions. The illusion of independence evaporates the moment profit or control is threatened.

"The government gave states back the bottle—but kept the cork."

It proved that government can admit failure without consequence, rewrite the rules without penalty, and claim victory while reversing its own tyranny.

The people didn't win. They were simply offered a better deal than chaos.

“The only amendment ever repealed proves the system only corrects when it collapses—and if the government can turn a profit forever afterwards.”

Amendment 22:

No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once.

What it did:

- Limits a president to two terms in office
- Was passed after FDR was elected four times
- Meant to prevent a repeat of "presidential reign"
- Appears to protect democracy by limiting executive power

Why it's broken—or a shallow fix at best:

1. It limits the person—not the power

A president can only serve two terms, but the executive system remains intact and untouched:

- Executive orders still override Congress
- War powers remain vague and unchecked
- Surveillance, veto power, emergency powers, and pardon powers all remain fully intact
- And none of it resets—just the name on the desk does

"It doesn't dismantle the throne—it just rotates who sits on it."

2. It was a political reaction—not a principled change

The amendment only passed because FDR broke the norm and got elected four times. So the system changed the rule after someone played it too well.

Had he lost, it never would've passed. That reveals how amendments aren't proactive—they're reactive, and often not to protect the people, but to preserve the balance of power within the political class.

"This wasn't foresight. It was damage control."

3. It says nothing about Congressional term limits

Why can a president serve only 8 years…

…but a senator or congressperson can serve 40?

The same logic behind this amendment—protecting the republic from permanent power—doesn't apply to the legislative branch, where lifetime careers are not only allowed but encouraged.

That's not a balance of power. That's a protected elite class.

Conclusion: The 22nd Amendment capped the presidency, but not the presidency's power.

- It was passed to block a man—not fix a machine.
- It gave the illusion of restraint while the executive branch continued growing unchecked.
- Meanwhile, career politicians in Congress remain immune to the very limitation imposed on the president.

U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton (1995) wasn't about presidents—it was about Congressional term limits. But the ruling confirmed something terrifying: term limits don't come from the people. They come from the Constitution. And unless the Constitution says no—you can say yes.

In this case, Arkansas tried to impose term limits on its own Congressional representatives. The Supreme Court struck it down. Why? Because states can't add qualifications not already in the Constitution.

Translation? If the Constitution doesn't prohibit it, it's allowed. And if it doesn't ban a third-term president from running as Vice President or Speaker of the House, then it's legally possible.

That's not conspiracy. That's Supreme Court logic. They ruled that states and citizens have no power to restrict federal office eligibility beyond what the Constitution says. So when it comes to the 22nd Amendment, here's the trap:

- It bans being elected president more than twice.
- It does not ban a former president from becoming Vice President.
- It does not ban a former president from becoming Speaker of the House.
- It does not ban succession back into power.

A president could serve two terms, sit out four years, run for Vice President—or ascend through succession—and hold power again. No law blocks it. No amendment prevents it. And U.S. Term Limits v. Thornton confirmed that unless the Constitution says "you can't," the door is open.

The ruling weaponized silence as permission. And that silence is how tyranny gets invited back in—through the side door of technicality.

“The 22nd doesn’t ban a third reign—it just reroutes it. And the Supreme Court already cleared the path.”

Amendment 23 (simplified)

- *Grants Washington, D.C. electors in presidential elections, as if it were a state*
- *D.C. gets the same number of electoral votes as the least populous state*
- *Congress retains power to enforce the amendment*

What it did:

- Allowed residents of Washington, D.C. to vote for President and Vice President
- Gave D.C. representation in the Electoral College
- Was passed in 1961 to address growing criticism that citizens in the capital had no say in federal leadership

Why it's broken—or more accurately, a rigged concession:

1. D.C. still isn't a state—and still lacks full representation

- D.C. has no voting senators
- Only one non-voting delegate in the House
- No real say in lawmaking, despite being home to more than 600,000 citizens
- And yet it's the epicenter of U.S. federal power

"You can live where the laws are made—but not have a vote in making them."

2. The number of electors is capped—by design

Even if D.C. had a population larger than some states (which it does), it still only gets three electoral votes, equal to the smallest state.

That's not representation. That's a fixed limit—a ceiling on influence, no matter how many people live there.

3. Congress holds the power to enforce—or ignore

Once again, Congress controls the implementation. That means D.C.'s limited power is only as real as Congress allows.

It's not true self-representation—it's a conditional allowance.

Adams v. Clinton (2000): The Government Admits You Have No Representation —Then Says That's Fine

In Adams v. Clinton, a group of D.C. residents sued for full voting representation in Congress. Their argument was simple: if we are citizens, taxed, and bound by federal law, we deserve actual representation—just like every other American.

The court didn't deny the facts.

It agreed that:

- D.C. residents pay taxes
- They serve in the military
- They are governed by federal law

But here's the punchline: the court still ruled that Congress had no constitutional obligation to fix it.

Why? Because "that's just how the Constitution was written."

Translation:

"Yes, you're unequal. Yes, you're taxed without full representation. But we don't have to do anything about it."

The court cited structural tradition over fairness. It admitted the injustice, then dismissed it as a design choice.

That wasn't just a ruling. That was a confession—that you can be a citizen of the United States, live in its capital, and still be legally ignored.

And worse?

The court said fixing it requires a constitutional amendment. But the 23rd Amendment already exists. It was passed to grant electoral power to D.C.

So the government's answer is:

"You have the right. But not ***that*** right."

Conclusion: The 23rd Amendment gave D.C. a voice—but only at a controlled volume.

- It was a compromise meant to silence criticism without granting real power.
- A symbolic vote in a rigged game.
- And proof that representation in America is not a right—it's a calculated concession.

"The 23rd didn't empower D.C.—it just muted the backlash."

Amendment 24:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged… by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

What it did:

- Abolished poll taxes in federal elections
- Targeted a common voter suppression tactic in the Jim Crow South
- Prevented federal-level vote denial based on non-payment of taxes
- Was ratified in 1964—nearly 200 years after the Constitution was signed

Why it's broken—or more like, incomplete:

1. It outlawed one fee—while ignoring the others

The 24th bans poll taxes, but not:

- The cost of government-issued ID
- Time off work (which isn't guaranteed for voting)
- Transportation to a polling place
- Registration hurdles and document fees
- Required digital access for registration in some states

"You don't pay to vote. You pay to exist long enough to reach the ballot."

2. It only applies to federal elections

States can—and often do—create burdens for local and state elections that still disenfranchise the poor.

The amendment doesn't stop states from designing indirect financial roadblocks.

3. It didn't stop systemic suppression

The real legacy of the 24th Amendment isn't the ban on poll taxes—it's the government's ability to say, "Look, we fixed it," while still:

- Closing polling places in poor or minority areas
- Purging voter rolls
- Gerrymandering away voting power
- Passing ID laws with cost-based barriers
- Ignoring federal enforcement of true accessibility

Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections (1966): The ruling that should have ended this debate—but didn't.

In Harper, the Supreme Court struck down Virginia's $1.50 poll tax. They ruled that wealth or payment cannot be a condition for voting.

Here's what they said:

"Voter qualifications have no relation to wealth nor to paying or not paying this or any other tax."

The Court made it crystal clear: any monetary barrier that prevents a citizen from voting is unconstitutional.

But instead of applying that logic to all financial burdens, they narrowed it. They killed the word "poll tax" but let the practice live on in disguise.

So what do we have today?

- If you owe fines, your registration can be blocked.
- If your ID expired, you can be denied.
- If you don't have time off or transport, you lose access.
- If you're poor, you're filtered out without the word "tax" ever being used.

Harper didn't fail. The government did. It rebranded financial obstruction as regulation.

And it worked—because most people only look for the word "tax." They don't see the invisible price tag slapped on every ballot for the poor, the disabled, the working class, and the marginalized.

"You have the right to vote—but only if you can afford to prove it."

Conclusion: The 24th Amendment outlawed the price to vote—but not the cost of being a voter.

It ended a tactic. It didn't end the strategy.

"The poll tax is gone—but the price of democracy keeps climbing."

Amendment 25: (summarized)

9. *If the President dies, resigns, or is removed, the Vice President becomes President.*

10. *If the Vice Presidency becomes vacant, the President nominates a new VP with confirmation by Congress.*

11. *The President can voluntarily transfer power to the VP by written declaration (e.g., surgery, illness).*

12. *The Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet can declare the President unfit—even if the President disagrees. If the President contests it, Congress decides who stays in power.*

What it did:

- Created a clear line of succession for presidential vacancy or incapacity
- Allowed for temporary or permanent transfer of executive power
- Was used after Nixon's resignation (Ford became President, Rockefeller became VP)
- Created a process for removing a sitting President without impeachment

Why it's dangerous:

1. It allows unelected power to rise by default

- If a President resigns or is removed, no new election is triggered
- The VP becomes President by default
- If that VP was appointed and not elected (like Ford), the highest office in the country is now held by someone nobody voted for

"The 25th doesn't preserve democracy—it bypasses it."

2. It legalizes a silent coup

Section 4 allows the VP and Cabinet to declare a President "unable to discharge the powers and duties" of the office.

This means:

- No trial

- No public process
- No voter input

If they act together, they can temporarily strip the President of power, and if challenged, Congress becomes the courtroom.

In other words: The government decides if the government stays in power.

3. It weaponizes loyalty

Cabinet members are appointed by the President—but under the 25th, they can vote to remove him.

This makes every Cabinet position a potential political knife:

- Appoint someone too loyal? They'll never act.
- Appoint someone ambitious? They might.

The 25th builds paranoia into the executive branch.

Conclusion: The 25th Amendment is not about stability—it's about survivability.

- It lets the system preserve itself, even if it means cutting out its own leader.
- It ensures continuity of government—not continuity of democracy.
- And it makes sure the machine runs, even if the driver is replaced behind the scenes.

The 25th doesn't protect the President or the People.

It protects government vulnerability to change with guarantees, designed to ensure power will transition—in any situation—based on government will alone.

"A government which allows unelected and/or intentional transfers of power to occur—where the designed solution doesn't include the people—and is controlled entirely by the government—isn't a democratic one."

Amendment 26:

The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged… on account of age.

What it did:

- Lowered the voting age from 21 to 18
- Passed in 1971, during the Vietnam War
- Was a direct response to the rising pressure of the "Old enough to fight, old enough to vote" movement
- Gave 18–20-year-olds the right to vote in federal, state, and local elections

Why it's broken—or more like, selectively honored:

1. It was reactive, not righteous

The amendment didn't happen because lawmakers believed in the maturity or rights of 18-year-olds.

It happened because 18-year-olds were dying in a war they had no vote to stop.

This was a PR move—an attempt to quiet national outrage by throwing young Americans a right they should have had all along.

"They were drafted first, enfranchised second."

2. It doesn't protect youth from systemic exclusion

The 26th bans age-based denial of voting rights—but it does nothing to:

- Prevent schools from being used as voter registration battlegrounds
- Stop gerrymandering from watering down youth-heavy districts
- Address the fact that many 18-year-olds are still in high school, and often too disempowered, uninformed, or economically restricted to effectively vote

So while they can vote—they're often deterred, delayed, or disregarded.

3. "Old enough to vote" doesn't mean "allowed to be heard"

- Youth votes are frequently dismissed as naive, uninformed, or impulsive.
- The system handed out the right—but attached no respect to it.

And when youth movements rise (climate, gun control, civil rights), they're met with surveillance, counter-narratives, and policy inertia.

"Fine, you can vote— but you get no voice—we will silence you one way or the other if you step too far."

Conclusion: The 26th Amendment gave youth the vote—but not the power that comes with it.

- It was an emergency concession—not a declaration of belief.
- The government didn't say "you're ready." It said "you're loud."

And in that moment, voting became not a gift of maturity, but a way to silence rebellion.

"The 26th proved you don't earn your rights through growth—you earn them through blood and backlash."

Amendment 27:

No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

What it did:

- Prevented Congress from giving itself immediate pay raises
- Any change in congressional pay can only take effect after the next election
- Originally proposed in 1789… and wasn't ratified until 1992
- It holds the record as the longest ratification process in U.S. history—over 202 years

Why it's broken—or utterly meaningless:

1. It's a speed bump, not a barrier

This amendment sounds like it limits congressional power—but it doesn't:

- Congress can still vote to raise its own pay

- They just have to wait until after the next election
- And since over 90% of incumbents are re-elected, it changes nothing

“It delays the abuse—it doesn’t deny it.”

2. It pretends the people have leverage

In theory, if voters hate the raise, they can vote lawmakers out.

But in practice:

- Gerrymandering rigs the map
- Name recognition and funding dominate elections
- Two-party loyalty trumps pay-based outrage

So the idea that this amendment gives the people any real say?

It’s a fantasy.

3. Its ratification proves how broken the system already was

The fact that this amendment sat unratified for two centuries, then suddenly passed in 1992, shows:

- It was never a priority
- It only passed once someone made enough noise
- And even now, it’s never used to stop anything—because Congress knows the loophole is built in

This amendment was meant to be a barrier. A check. A pause button. It says Congress can vote on its own pay—but that raise won’t kick in unless the people re-elect you afterward. That’s accountability.

But that’s not what happened.

Instead, Congress exploited the system. They created a workaround—automatic “cost-of-living adjustments” (COLAs). These quietly increase their pay every year without ever requiring a new vote or public debate. No law. No headlines. No consequences.

It’s a constitutional violation dressed as fiscal policy.

COLAs are pre-programmed raises baked into the budget. They happen without intervention, triggered by inflation indexes—not elections. Which means **Congress benefits**—without ever having to ask permission from the people.

And when it was finally challenged in court? The system protected itself.

In **Schaffer v. Clinton (2001)**, a sitting member of Congress argued that COLAs violated the 27th Amendment because they altered compensation without the mandated electoral check. The court dismissed the case—not because it lacked merit, but because they said no law had been "passed." The raises were automatic. So, according to the court, it didn't count.

Worse, the ruling stated that members of Congress had no standing to sue—even while benefiting from the unconstitutional increase.

That's not justice. That's institutional self-preservation.

The 27th Amendment was designed to prevent hidden raises. So the government responded by automating them—removing the fingerprints but keeping the payoff.

Congress doesn't raise its pay anymore. The machine does it for them. And the courts pretend the machine isn't theirs.

If a citizen did this, it would be called fraud. But when government does it, it's called policy.

"If I rob you with a robot, I didn't commit the crime—I just built the system."

Closing Statement — Verdict Delivered

This document does not ask the government to explain itself.

- It **proves** that it no longer represents the Constitution.
- It **proves** the betrayal.

And it **demands accountability**—not just for what was done, but for what has become the norm.

- Every amendment.
- Every right.
- Every protection enshrined in the foundation of this country—**violated**.

These are not theories. They are historical facts, legal cases, and living consequences. And if even one violation goes unanswered, **all future protections are fiction.**

I did not take an oath to defend just my country.

I took an oath to defend the **Constitution**.

And I am telling you now—it's been taken hostage by the very system that swears to uphold it.

You—the reader—The People—are the final jury.

And whether you sit in a courtroom, classroom, newsroom, or Capitol Hill office, you must now choose:

Will you remain complicit in silence? Or will you stand in truth—even when it convicts your own country?

Because now you know. And if you ignore this, you're not just allowing the collapse. **You are endorsing it.**

- This is not a threat.
- This is a warning.
- And it is my final act of service.

I rest my case.

— Jason M. Ernst

U.S. Army Veteran

Constitutional Witness

American by birth. Defender by oath.

© 2025 Jason M. Ernst. Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0. Attribution required.
Non-commercial use only. Derivatives must be shared alike.